# AC

## Framework

Action theory precedes ethics. We need a basic account of what an action is and its relation to intention before ethics can be sound. **Anscombe 58** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**That I owe the grocer** such-and-such **a sum would be one** of a set of **fact**s **which would be "brute" in relation to** the description **"I am a bilker."** "Bilking" is of course a species of "dishonesty" or "injustice." (Naturally the consideration will not have any effect on my actions unless I want to commit or avoid acts of injustice.) So far, in spite of their strong associations, I conceive "bilking," "injustice" and "dishonesty" in a merely "factual" way. That I can do this for "bilking" is obvious enough; "justice" I have no idea how to define, except that its sphere is that of actions which relate to someone else, but "injustice," its defect, can for the moment be offered as a generic name covering various species. E.g.: "bilking," "theft" (which is relative to whatever property institutions exist), "slander," "adultery," "punishment of the innocent." **In present-day philosophy an explanation is required how an unjust man is a bad man, or an unjust action a bad one**; to give such an explanation belongs to **ethics**; but it **cannot** even **be begun until we are equipped with a sound philosophy of psychology.** For the proof that an unjust man is a bad man would require a positive account of justice as a "virtue." This part of the subject-matter of ethics is, however, completely closed to us until we have an account of what type of characteristic a virtue is-a problem, not of ethics, but of conceptual analysis-and how it relates to the actions in which it is instanced: a matter which I think Aristotle did not succed in really making clear. For this **we** certainly **need an account at least of what a human action is at all, and how its description** as "doing such-and-such" **is affected by** its motive and by the **intention** or intentions in it; and for this an account of such concepts is required.

However, actions are not always pre-determined by intention. Many of our actions are influenced by the creative dimension of freedom. Creativity arises through spontaneous action in reaction to shifts in circumstances caused by natural forces.

**Connolly 13** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

As individual and collective agents of multiple types, we exercise one dimension of freedom when we pursue existing desires and another when we reflexively reconsider them and seek outlets to act upon revised desires. But those desires are not merely given in the first instance, and the reflexive process in the second does not always render explicit what was already “implicit” in operative assumptions and desires. There is often more pluripotentiality in the rush of desire forward to consolidation in action than is captured by the lazy idea of the implicit. **There is** also **pluripotentiality during** those fecund **moments when an entire constituency coalesces under** new circumstances, with the change in “circumstances” often shaped by **rapid shifts in nonhuman force fields** with which they are involved. **In such circumstances the creative element of freedom comes into play**. To put the point briefly, neither the tradition of negative freedom nor that of positive freedom comes to terms sufficiently with the role of creativity in freedom. Creativity here means, as a first cut action by the present upon ambiguities arising from the past oriented toward the future in a way that is not entirely reducible to the past as either implicit in the present or an aggregation of blind causes that produce the future. It might involve an exploratory movement back and forth between different parties in a cloudy situation that issues in a new result none intended at the start. These initiatives may then be consolidated by disciplinary processes and tactics that help to sediment them into the soft tissues of cultural life. Reflexivity, you might say, begins to do its work after the uncanny, creative element in freedom has begun to unfold, for good or ill. Creative processes flow through and over us, and reflexivity doubles the creative adventure. **Actions are** thus **not entirely controlled by pre-existing intentions**; rather the creative dimension helps to compose and refine intentions as they become consolidated in action. To articulate the creative dimension of freedom, then, is to insert a fundamental qualification or hesitation into the ideas of both the masterful agent and agency as the activation of intentions already there. The creative element is located somewhere between active and passive agency. When creative freedom is underway in an unsettled context we may find ourselves allowing or encouraging a new thought, desire, or strategy to crystallize out of the confusion and nest of proto-thoughts that precede it. An agent, individual or collective, can help to open the portals of creativity, but it cannot will that which is creative to come into being by intending the result before it arrives. Real creativity is thus tinged with uncertainty and mystery. **The creative dimension of freedom** discloses an ambiguity that haunts extant ideas of intention, desire, agency, and reflexivity. It **exposes the ambiguity of agency** in the practice of freedom. This ambiguity may find expression**, say, in a basketball game as a**n accomplished **player** under intense defensive pressure **spontaneously fires up the first jump shot ever** attempted **amid the flow of action**. The shot, initially lacking a name, surprises the shooter and mystifies defenders. It was not implicit in the athlete’s repertoire; it emerged in the pressure of action. After being repeated, named, and perfected through relentless training, it may spread like wildfire across the basketball landscape, as that type of shot did in the 1950s in the United States. Everything else in the game now shifts to some degree too. Other players, coaches, and referees now adopt creative responses to it, generating changes in the game through a mélange of partisan mutual adjustments that no individual or organization intended at the outset. Or take a young point guard who spontaneously completes a fast break with a blind, behind-the-back pass and then finds himself negotiating with his coach to decide just when such passes can be allowed in the future. Such modes of **creative**, mutual **adjustment**, neither simply assignable to one player or coach, nor fitting neatly into extant notions of preformed intention, nor reducible to a reflexive dialectic, **occur all the time in multiple domains. They form part of the essence of freedom.**

2 additional warrants.

A. Creativity is key to value to life. **Connolly 13** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

If **creativity finds expression in** the human estate, it will sometimes do so at surprising moments during a disruption in a practice, opening the door to a **scientific invention, a new concept,** a **political initiative,** a new **social movement,** an **artistic innovation, market spontaneity,** a **language change**, a cooking invention, teaching improvisation, a new type of film scene, a musical production, the use of new media, or the invention of a new product. And so on endlessly. Our **identification with life** – our tacit sense of belonging to a human predicament **worthy of embrace** – **is partly rooted in reflexive reconsideration of** established **desires and ends. But it is grounded too in** those **uncanny** experiences of **creativity by** means of **which something new enters the world**. This may be one of the reasons people cleave to the sweetness of life. **It ties the sweetness of life to a vitality of being**, even more than to a preordained end, purpose, or “fullness” with which it is officially invested. The intimate relation between freedom and creativity is why **freedom is never sufficiently grasped by** the idea of **a lack to be fulfilled,** successful action upon **preset desires, or the drive to render the implicit explicit**. The experience of uncertainty or incompleteness is sometimes an occasion of fecundity.

B. The creative dimension of freedom is key to acts of protest that shape discourse.

**Connolly 13** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

The basketball example already suggests that creativity and spontaneity are not confined to economic markets. So consider politics. Take that moment in feudal Ireland in which **peasants exploited by** a landlord named **Thomas Boycott creatively organized** an entire community **to stop using his products**, fomenting an innovative strategy of protest that also produced a creative innovation in language. We call such now well-honed strategies boycotts today. It is unlikely that any of those who joined the meetings to resist Thomas Boycott intended to invent a boycott before participating in that collective process of gestation. Or consider the dispersed, illegal minority that organized and sustained an underground railroad to provide those striving to escape plantation slavery a route marked by periodic tunnels, river crossings, overground trails, and save houses. Or follow the life of Frederick Douglass as he assembled creative strategies to learn how to read in a state when it was illegal to acquire such a skill. Or those who “invented” and participated in the first teach-in in American at the University of Michigan to protest the Vietnam War and to educate ill-informed citizens about its effects. Or that governor in Michigan who ordered the National Guard not to crush the 1937 sit-down strike, itself creatively organized by workers in Flint, but to protect the workers who had introduced the innovation. **Or** those **protesters in Egypt who creatively used Twitter, cell phones, and Facebook to** organize themselves and **outwit the police**. Or the gays at Stonewall who organized a series of protests after yet another violent police raid. Or Mahatma Gandhi, who roused a whole country to nonviolent resistance to free India from English imperialism. Or those students, professors, and investors in several countries who organized investment boycotts to oppose apartheid. Or multiple minorities within territorial states who have gradually found themselves shifting from seeking tolerance in a state organized around a hegemonic center to demanding a more decentered mode of pluralism that forges an ethos of agonistic respect between and among minorities of several types. And consider the shifts in language occasioned by such creative innovations, through which **a new** term or **phrase is introduced into** a web of **discourse that had heretofore seemed complete** to many**. Terms such as boycott, underground railroad,** safe house, **teach-in,** sit-down strike, sit-in, **Twitter,** Stonewall, agonistic respect, **and nonviolent resistance consolidate such innovations, rendering them ready-made possibilities** to consider **in the future**. To the extent such innovative terms stick, they augment the supply of future actions and set a state for new alternatives yet to riff upon them. The array of strategies becomes augmented, even as authorities prepare to respond in new ways to their most recent iterations. **There are certainly negative innovations** too, such as becoming a scab, inventing fracking, inventing the Guantanamo Gulag, or organizing a neoliberal Tea Party to protest a new regime right after the last regime has presided over an economic meltdown. **But noble innovations must** also **be listed** from time to time, particularly **as you engage** a philosophy of **neolib**eralism **that both celebrates spontaneity and limits its application** so **severely**. Good night, Professor Friedman. Good morning, Mr. Hayek.

Neoliberalism destroys creativity, rendering the system unsustainable. Striking a balance between creativity and reflexivity is key to a new culture outside of neoliberalism. **Connolly 13** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

The danger of “serfdom” today, you might say, is the emergence of a regime in which a few **corporate overlords monopolize creativity** to sustain a bankrupt way of life; in which military, prison, and security budgets are increased significantly to cling to American hegemony in a world unfavorable to it; in which the element of **creativity is squeezed out of work life** for many citizens; in which the ideology of **freedom is winnowed to** a set of **consumer choices between preset options**; and in which compensatory drives to extremism in secular dogmatism and religious faith intensify. Moderate **neolib**eralism **cannot sustain itself under these circumstances**. Its erstwhile **proponents are** today **pressed either to allow a new priority** to course through them **or** to **give themselves to** an **extremism** many have heretofore hesitated to accept. But is there not also a tension in the positive account pursued here? Yes. **If you embrace** both an ethos of **responsibility** encoded into multiple interacting practices **and the creative element** in freedom**, you have introduced** a **tension between** these two **values. Any theory that acknowledges only one value, as radical neoliberals** tend to **do** in one way and holists in another**, is not worth its salt.** The question is how to negotiate the tension. Perhaps **the best hope is to** keep one eye on each of these values. We **keep the door open to creativity** in the practices of art, citizen movements, entrepreneurial innovations, court interpretations, sports activity, scientific experiments, religious movements, consumption choices, state modes of regulation, and the like **as we also commit ourselves to debate the quality of these innovations situationally with one eye on their probable effects** up**on the** interim **future.** That is one reason the elements of **care for the world and reflexivity are** so **important to a culture that prizes** the element of **creativity**. There is no guarantee we will always get the balance right, particularly in a world that is periodically jolted by surprises. But at least we will have committed ourselves to pay due attention to the several elements in play, keeping in mind that both the element of creativity and participating with dignity in a larger system help to make life worth living.

Independently, neoliberalism precludes ethics by reducing decision-making to economic self-interest.

**Sachikonye 10**[[6]](#footnote-6)

In terms of individual citizens neo-liberal government promotes the notion of the responsible citizen. Thus, the ideal individual in neo-liberal society practises personal responsibility by making informed rational decisions. **Neo-lib**eral democracy therefore ―**aspires to construct prudent subjects whose moral quality** is based on the fact that they rationally assess the costs and benefits of a certain act as opposed to other alternative acts‖ (Lemke, 2001: 201). Neo-liberal governments together with corporations create conditions in which the responsible rational individual can become a successful entrepreneur or consumer. The success or failure of the individual **depends on** his or her **skill and work ethic.** Hence, life for an individual in neo-liberal society becomes one of personal responsibility to a greater extent. Giroux 53 argues that under neo-liberalism the state no longer assumes responsibility for social needs and rather focuses on initiating various ‗deregulations and privatizations‘, whilst relinquishing all social responsibility to the ‗market and private philanthropy‘ (2004). **The neo-liberal state has no** real **obligation to**wards its **citizens except to provide** the **necessary conditions for** entrepreneurship and **consumerism.** As a result, a kind of **Darwinist ‘survival of the fittest’** ethic **becomes apparent**; Giroux argues that: ―[s]ocial Darwinism has been resurrected from the ashes of the 19th century sweatshops and can now be seen in full bloom in most reality TV programs and **in** the **unfettered self-interests that now drives popular culture.** As narcissism is replaced by unadulterated materialism, public concerns collapse into utterly private considerations and where public space does exist it is mainly used as a confessional for private woes, a cut throat game of winner take all, or an advertisement for consumerism‖ (2004) 54 . This is a sentiment that is echoed by Bourdieu 55 , who states that **this** form of moral Darwinism **establishes** what he terms **the ‘cult of the winner’** and ultimately institutes a survival of the fittest mentality that is **underpinned by cynicism and self interest** (1998). The neo-liberal state utilises knowledge like market research as a technique of power. This is similar to how the government in the 17 th century viewed statistics as the ‗science of the state‘ and a component of the technology of government (Smart, 2002: 129). The neoliberal government can now use market research to indirectly control its citizens as well as gather information about their personal lives. Market research with its use of modern technology and accurate data supersedes census studies and statistics. Dufour writes: ―[v]ast numbers of market researchers are therefore always taking the pulse of consumers and surveying their sexual and emotional lives, so as to anticipate their needs and to give their desires possible names and credible destinations‖ (2008: 58). The collecting of such information and the use of it to control citizens fits the Foucauldian critique. The field of marketing is a highly efficient technology of neo-liberal governance; it becomes a mechanism through which neo-liberal government can regulate a consumer society and provide specific products to cater for the varied needs of different individuals. Dufour notes: ―[t]here is no such thing as a small profit. A profit can be made from babies who ‗want‘ their favourite shampoo, senior citizens who ‗want‘ to occupy their spare time and invest their savings, poor adolescents who ‗want‘ cheap brand names and rich adolescents who ‗want‘ their own cars. They must all be satisfied. ‗I‘ is now central to every advert‖ (2008: 58). Neo-liberalism dominates society through subtle means. Thus, neo-liberalism does not seek ‗to assert itself by placing disciplinary controls on life‘ (Dufour, 2008: 157). Neo-liberalism has permeated society by using subtle ‗political technologies‘. These mechanisms of power transcend the old overt ‗technologies‘: religion, the police and family, and are more flexible in that they are less reliant on coercion and are less costly, as noted by Dufour (2008: 157). The new political technologies of neo-liberal governance include: the internet, multimedia software, the fields of marketing and management, as well as telecommunications technology governance have yielded more control, management and surveillance than any traditional government could have hoped for. **Neo-lib**eral governance has also **managed to dehumanise** human society **by forcing the complexity of human difference into the narrow confines of** entrepreneurialism, **consumerism** and the logic of self interest. Fine and Leopold write: ―[a]re we the manipulated mannequins of the advertising industry, the sovereignless victims of profit-hungry corporate capital, rational economic man and women trading off one commodity against another according to their relative prices and utilities?‖ (1993: 3). This is indeed a grim question to fathom but one which neo-liberal governance has made pertinent.

Thus the standard is **resisting neoliberalism**.

## Advocacy

I advocate the Precautionary Principle on resource extraction issues. I reserve the right to clarify.

## Contention

The World Trade Organization is using its trade authority to challenge environmental protection and prioritize resource extraction.

**Global Exchange 11** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

5. The WTO Is Destroying the Environment **The WTO is being used by corporations to dismantle** hard-won local and national **environmental protections, which are attacked as “barriers to trade.”** The very first WTO panel ruled that a provision of the US Clean Air Act, requiring both domestic and foreign producers alike to produce cleaner gasoline, was illegal. The WTO declared illegal a provision of the Endangered Species Act that requires shrimp sold in the US to be caught with an inexpensive device allowing endangered sea turtles to escape. **The WTO is attempting to deregulate industries including logging, fishing, water** utilities**, and energy distribution, which will lead to further exploitation of** these **natural resources.**

The PP challenges WTO authority over environmental issues. This is key to generating momentum to shut down the WTO.

**Mokhiber and Weissman 99** write[[8]](#footnote-8)

**The WTO eviscerates the Precautionary Principle**. **WTO rules** generally **block countries from acting in response to potential risk** -- requiring a probability before governments can move to resolve harms to human health or the environment. The WTO squashes diversity. WTO rules establish international health, environmental and other standards as a global ceiling through a process of "harmonization;" countries or even states and cities can only exceed them by overcoming high hurdles. The WTO operates in secrecy. Its tribunals rule on the "legality" of nations' laws, but carry out their work behind closed doors. **The WTO limits governments' ability to use their purchasing dollar for** human rights, **environmental**, worker rights and other non-commercial **purposes**. In general, **WTO rules state that governments can make purchases based only on quality and cost** considerations. The WTO disallows bans on imports of goods made with child labor. In general, WTO rules do not allow countries to treat products differently based on how they were produced -- irrespective of whether made with brutalized child labor, with workers exposed to toxics or with no regard for species protection. The WTO legitimizes life patents. WTO rules permit and in some cases require patents or similar exclusive protections for life forms. Some of these problems, such as the WTO's penchant for secrecy, could potentially be fixed, but the core problems -- **prioritization of commercial** over other **values**, the constraints on democratic decision-making **and** the **bias against local economies** -- cannot, for they **are inherent in the WTO itself. Because of these** unfixable **problems, the W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization **should be shut down**, sooner rather than later. That doesn't mean interim steps shouldn't be taken. It does mean that **beneficial reforms will** focus not on adding new areas of competence to the WTO or enhancing its authority, even if the new areas appear desirable (such as labor rights or competition). Instead, the reforms to pursue are those that reduce or **limit the WTO's power** -- for example, **by denying it** the **authority to invalidate laws passed pursuant to international environmental agreements**, limiting application of WTO agricultural rules in the Third World, or eliminating certain subject matters (such as essential medicines or life forms) from coverage under the WTO's intellectual property agreement. **These measures** are necessary and desirable in their own right, and they **would help generate momentum to close down the WTO.**

The WTO promotes global neoliberalism. US influence over the WTO drives the support of brutal dictators.

**Makwana 6** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, **neoliberal policies are propagated through the** IMF, World Bank and **WTO. Neolib**eralism **favours the free-market as the most efficient method of** global **resource allocation**. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources. There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries. The neoliberal experiment has failed to combat extreme poverty, has exacerbated global inequality, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries. Introduction After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state. Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic **globalization is driven by this ideology**; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy. The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives. There is a consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions. There is a huge discrepancy between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. **Neolib**eral **policies** have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they **have been unable to benefit those** living **in** extreme **poverty** who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.) **Neolib**eralism **has also been unable to address growing** levels of **global inequality.** Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China). The **shortcomings of neolib**eral policy **are** also **apparent in** the well documented **economic disasters suffered by** countries in **Latin America and South Asia** in the 1990s. These **countries were left with no choice but to follow** the neoliberal model of **privatization and deregulation, due to** their **financial problems and pressure** from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world. The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. **Securing resources** and economic dominance **has been** and continues to be **the US**A**’s main economic objective**. According to Maria Páez Victor: “Since 1846 the United States has carried out no fewer than 50 military invasions and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of perceived threats to its economic control and expansion. **For this reason it has** also **supported** some of the region’s most **vicious dictators such as** Batista, Somoza, **Trujillo, and Pinochet**.” As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. **The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities**; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.

Neoliberal ideology makes extinction inevitable. It sidelines concerns of ecological sustainability through unhindered pursuit of resource extraction and leads to war.

**Bristow 10** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

In recent years, regional development strategies have been subjugated to the hegemonic discourse of competitiveness, such that the ultimate objective for all regional development policy-makers and practitioners has become the creation of economic advantage through superior productivity performance, or the attraction of new ﬁrms and labour (Bristow, 2005). A major consequence is the developing ‘ubiquitiﬁcation’ of regional development strategies (Bristow, 2005; Maskell and Malmberg, 1999). This reﬂects the status of competitiveness as a key discursive construct (Jessop, 2008) that has acquired hugely signiﬁcant rhetorical power for certain interests intent on reinforcing capitalist relations (Bristow, 2005; Fougner, 2006). Indeed, the competitiveness hegemony is such that **many policies** previously **considered** only **indirectly relevant to unfettered** economic **growth tend to be hijacked in support of competitiveness agendas** (for example Raco, 2008; also Dannestam, 2008). This paper will argue, however, that a particularly narrow **discourse of ‘competitiveness’ has** been constructed that has a number of **negative connotations for** the ‘resilience’ of regions. Resilience is deﬁned as the region’s ability to experience **positive economic success that is socially inclusive, works within environmental limits and** which **can ride global economic punches** (Ashby et al., 2009). As such, resilience clearly resonates with literatures on sustainability, localisation and diversiﬁcation, and the developing understanding of regions as intrinsically diverse entities with evolutionary and context-speciﬁc development trajectories (Hayter, 2004). In contrast, the **dominant discourse of competitiveness is ‘placeless’ and increasingly associated with globalised, growth-ﬁrst and environmentally malign agendas** (Hudson, 2005). However, this paper will argue that the relationships between competitiveness and resilience are more complex than might at ﬁrst appear. Using insights from the Cultural Political Economy (CPE) approach, which focuses on understanding the construction, development and spread of hegemonic policy discourses, the paper will argue that the dominant discourse of competitiveness used in regional development policy is narrowly constructed and is thus insensitive to contingencies of place and the more nuanced role of competition within economies. This leads to problems of resilience that can be partly overcome with the development of a more contextualised approach to competitiveness. The paper is now structured as follows. It begins by examining the developing understanding of resilience in the theorising and policy discourse around regional development. It then describes the CPE approach and utilises its framework to explain both how a narrow conception of competitiveness has come to dominate regional development policy and how resilience inter-plays in subtle and complex ways with competitiveness and its emerging critique. The paper then proceeds to illustrate what resilience means for regional development ﬁrstly, with reference to the Transition Towns concept, and then by developing a typology of regional strategies to show the different characteristics of policy approaches based on competitiveness and resilience. Regional resilience Resilience is rapidly emerging as an idea whose time has come in policy discourses around localities and regions, where it is developing widespread appeal owing to the peculiarly powerful combination of transformative pressures from below, and various catalytic, crisis-induced imperatives for change from above. It features strongly in policy discourses around environmental management and sustainable development (see Hudson, 2008a), but has also more recently emerged in relation to emergency and disaster planning with, for example ‘Regional Resilience Teams’ established in the English regions to support and co-ordinate civil protection activities around various emergency situations such as the threat of a swine ﬂu pandemic. The discourse of resilience is also taking hold in discussions around desirable local and regional development activities and strategies. The recent global ‘credit crunch’ and the accompanying in-crease in livelihood insecurity has highlighted the advantages of those local and regional economies that have greater ‘resilience’ by virtue of being less dependent upon globally footloose activities, hav-ing greater economic diversity, and/or having a de-termination to prioritise and effect more signiﬁcant structural change (Ashby et al, 2009; Larkin and Cooper, 2009). Indeed, **resilience features particular strongly** in the ‘grey’ literature spawned by thinktanks, consul-tancies and environmental interest groups **around the consequences of the global recession, catastrophic climate change and the arrival of** the era of **peak oil** for localities and regions with all its implications for the longevity of carbon-fuelled economies, cheap, long-distance transport and global trade. **This popularly labelled ‘triple crunch’** (New Economics Foundation, 2008) **has powerfully illuminated the potentially disastrous material consequences of the** voracious **growth imperative at the heart of** neoliberalism and **competitiveness, both in the form of resource constraints (especially food security) and** in **the inability** of the current system **to manage global ﬁnancial and ecological sustainability.** In so doing, it appears to be galvinising previously disparate, fractured debates about the merits of the current system, and challenging public and political opinion to develop a new, global concern with frugality, egalitarianism and localism (see, for example Jackson, 2009; New Economics Foundation, 2008).

Engaging the state is key. Pure critique can’t solve, and the aff is a form of engagement without being statist. **Connolly 8** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

Before turning to possible strategies to promote these objectives, we need to face an objection posed by one segment of the left: "Don't you depend a lot upon the state, when it must be viewed as the enemy?" My response is threefold. First, **there is no way to take on** global **warming without engaging the state** in the effort as well as international agencies, and global warming is a key danger of this epoch. Second, **it is less the state** itself **and more its** existing **subsidies** and priorities that are at issue. If you were to oppose both the market and the state **you** might **reduce** **the** democratic **left to pure critique, with no presentation of positive possibilities and strategies.** But **critique is always important and never enough**, as the left has begun to rediscover and as the American right has known for forty years. Third, **although one must acknowledge** the issues of cumbersome state **bureaucracy**, corporate **crony­ism**, **and** state **corruption**, all three increased radically when the evangelical-capitalist resonance machine achieved hegemony, and **they will get worse unless eco-egalitarians enter the fray at the** interceded **level**s **of** micropolitics, microeconomic experiments, and **the state**. It is unwise to act as if the state must always be what it has become. Challenging the media is critical in this respect, making it become a watchdog of corporations, the state, religious movements, and the multiple imbrications between them. My view, as be­comes clear in the next few pages, is that **no interim agenda** onthe left **can proceed far without** finding expression in **state policy,** and state policy must draw inspiration from microeconomic experiments initially launched outside its canopy: **microeconomic experiments and creative state policies must in­form each other**. **We** thus **seek to include the state without becoming statist.** Those who invest hope in revolutionary overthrow may oppose such a com­bination. I suspect that revolution, were it to occur, would undermine rather than vitalize democratic culture.29

## Next is Theory Preempts

1. Case outweighs theory. Theory kills creativity which is key to meaningful political discourse, that’s Connolly 13.

2. Gutcheck against dumb theory. Competing interps leads to a race to the bottom where every round comes down to theory, killing substantive education. Intervention is inevitable in blippy theory debates.

3. Prefer aff interpretations. Key to clash. **O’Donnell 4** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

**AFC preserves the value of the first aff**irmative constructive **speech. This speech is the starting point for the debate.** It is a function of necessity. The debate must begin somewhere if it is to begin at all. **Failure to grant AFC** is a denial of the service rendered by the affirmative team’s labor when they crafted this speech. Further, if the affirmative does not get to pick the starting point, **[renders] the opening speech** act is essentially rendered **meaningless while the rest of the debate becomes a debate about what we should be debating about.**

4. Err aff on theory because of time skew. This also means presume aff if presumption matters.

5. The aff doesn’t have to implement a specific policy. Decision rules like the PP are key to the most accurate interp for the topic.

**Nebel 14** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

I hear that many affirmatives on this topic defend the implementation of a particular policy or set of policies in developing countries. The classic framing of this issue has been in terms of an Aims vs. Implementation dichotomy, which has carried over from the Jan/Feb 2013 topic about valuing rehabilitation above retribution. In this article, I’ll explain why I think that is a false dichotomy, and how you can strategically get past this framing of the issue. The most important word in the resolution, for the purposes of this disagreement, is ‘prioritize.’ This is because a topical affirmative advocacy has to do the thing that the resolution says ought to be done. In this case, that’s prioritization. Now, if you just stop there, you might have the following thought: if a topical advocacy just needs to prioritize environmental protection (EP) over resource extraction (RE), then implementing some particular policy that prioritizes EP over RE is, ceteris paribus, topical. But that’s not a good inference. The reason is that what has to do the prioritizing in order to be topical is the agent. Your advocacy must be that the agent prioritize EP over RE, whatever that means. In this case, that agent is ‘developing countries.’ **Just because an agent implements some policy** or set of policies that prioritize EP over RE **does not mean that the agent** itself **prioritizes EP over RE**. This may seem like a picky distinction, but consider some examples. **Suppose I chose to spend time with my friends tonight, rather than work on a paper**. This choice might prioritize friendship over work. But this choice does not make it the case that I prioritize friendship over work. **I might actually** be the kind of person who **prioritize**s **work over friendship, so that I almost always choose to write a paper** when I could instead hang out with friends**, but this** night **is the rare opportunity when I hang out with my friends**. So, just because some choice or action prioritizes one thing over another does not entail that the agent prioritizes one thing over another. If we assume that an advocacy is topical only if it makes it the case that the agent does what the resolution says it ought to do, then this means that implementing a particular policy that prioritizes EP over RE is not enough to be topical. (That is, absent evidence about this policy having the effect of changing developing countries’ priorities as a whole. But then this advocacy might only be effects-topical.) People might respond with a definition of EP or RE in terms of policies. This definition might show that the objects to be prioritized are sets of policies, or some common feature of policies, rather than an abstract aim. But the relevant question is not Aims vs. Implementation: that framing of the topic only persists because of Jan/Feb 2013, on which people defined 'rehabilitation' and 'retribution' as either an aim or a kind of policy. But Aims vs. Implementation is not the correct contrast. The correct contrasts are Aims vs. Policies, and Prioritization vs. Implementation. The point is that prioritizing some kind of policy is not the same as implementing some policy from that set. Aims vs. Policies is a matter of the direct object, whereas Prioritization vs. Implementation is a matter of the verb. **We can agree that EP and RE are sets** or kinds **of policies, but** think **that the resolution is about which we ought to prioritize, not** which we ought to **implement**. However, this does not mean that the anti-policy side completely wins. People who wish to defend an anti-policy interpretation often make their interpretations too strong, by **suggesting** that **no questions of implementation are relevant**. That **seems** to me **false**. To see why, consider a variation on my earlier example about hanging out with my friends or writing a paper. Suppose I used to prioritize work over friendship, but I now prioritize friendship over work. It seems that I am now more likely to spend time with my friends, when this trades off with writing a paper, than I used to be. This is because **an agent’s priorities shape her decisions**. They don’t guarantee that an agent will always choose any particular action that better reflects those priorities. But they will lead to different patterns of actions on the whole. If this is right, then **the most accurate Aims-based interp**retation of the topic **allows that the aff**irmative **advocacy leads to** the **implementation of policies that prioritize EP over RE as an effect**, although the affirmative can’t advocate any particular policy. Implementation of particular policies is an effect, which can be used to garner advantages or disadvantages, but cannot be the affirmative advocacy. And any particular effect of that kind can only be known with some uncertain probability; it cannot be assumed to occur as a matter of fiat.

# Frontlines

## AT Cap K

Resisting neolib is key even if it doesn’t address capitalism as a whole.

**Connolly 13** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

It is also true that **the above critique concentrates on neolib**eral capitalism, not capitalism writ large. That is because it seems to me that we need to specify the terms of critique as closely as possible and think first of all about interim responses. If we lived under, say, Keynesian capitalism, a somewhat different set of issues would be defined and other strategies identified. **Capitalism writ large** – while it sets a general context that neoliberalism inflects in specific ways – **sets too large and generic a target. It can assume multiple forms**, as the differences between Swedish and American capitalism suggest; **the times demand** a set of **interim agendas targeting the hegemonic form of today**, pursued with heightened militancy at several sites. **The point** today **is not to wait for a revolution** that overthrows the whole system. **The “system**,**”** as we shall see further, **is replete with too many** loose ends, uneven edges, **dicey intersections with nonhuman forces, and uncertain trajectories to make** such **a wholesale project plausible. Besides,** things are too urgent and **too many people** on the ground **are suffering too much now.**

## AT Ks (General)

Simply critiquing without engaging the state cedes the political to neoliberal forces.

**Connolly 13** writes[[15]](#footnote-15)

I am sure that the forgoing comments will appear to some as “optimistic” or “utopian.” But optimism and pessimism are both primarily spectatorial views. Neither seems sufficient to the contemporary condition. Indeed pessimism, if you dwell on it long, easily slides into cynicism, and **cynicism** often **plays into the hands of a right wing that applies it** exclusively **to** any set of **state activities not designed to protect** or coddle **the corporate estate**. That is one reason that “dysfunctional politics’ redounds so readily to the advantage of cynics on the right who work to promote it. **They want to promote cynicism with respect to the state and innocence with respect to the market**. Pure critique, as already suggested, does not suffice either. **Pure critique too readily carries critics** and their followers **to the edge of cynicism.**

## AT Indigenous Neg

WTO regulations kill cultural diversity of indigenous peoples.

**FOE 3** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

7. **The WTO is eroding cultural diversity: The WTO TRIPs Agreement allows companies to expropriate knowledge from local peoples in developing countries** who, in many cases, have been cultivators, researchers and protectors of plants for thousands of years. **The** TRIPs **Agreement permits** (primarily Northern) **t**ransnatio**n**al **c**ompanie**s to claim traditional** plant varieties or **plant uses as ‘inventions’ that must be respected the world over. Culture could** also **be further eroded if issues surrounding** the **entertainment** business - for example, films, broadcasting, music

**AT DCs Want Trade Rules**

Developing countries were pressured into the WTO.

**Shahin 96** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

The establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as the custodian and guarantor of a rule-based multilateral trading system was one of the cornerstones of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTNs) concluded at Geneva on 14 December 1993 and the signing of the Final Act as a 'single undertaking' at Marrakesh on 15 April 1994. The WTO is to be a dynamic framework for ensuring that trade rules and their effectiveness can keep pace with the evolution of the world economy and its Multilateral Trading System (MTS). There are no U-turns. One hundred and twenty countries have signed and are expected to abide by the WTO rules as well as its rulings. **The main reason** - in my view - **for developing countries signing the agreements** in Marrakesh **was** the **fear of being left behind, rather than truly being convinced of** any **benefit accruing to them** from the agreements. It is no exaggeration to say that **developing countries are still grappling with problems** of implementation **of the** various **agreements** annexed to the WTO **and** striving to understand **their full ramifications on their economies**. Whether developing countries are now better integrated in the global economy or into the so-called 'economic mainstream' will remain open until there is an effective implementation of the WTO agreements. No one can, however, deny that a number of developing countries participated actively in the Uruguay Round and contributed to the successful outcome of the negotiations, though only a few of them were considered as major players. Most developing countries made substantial commitments on market access, consolidating the results of their liberalisation programmes undertaken unilaterally. For several developing countries the average Most Favoured Nation (MFN) tariff reduction on industrial products was comparable to or greater than that of the countries in the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (e.g. India, Republic of Korea, Venezuela and Brazil). For others the reduction was proportionately smaller, but from a level that was in general higher than in developed countries. A number of developing countries emerged from the Uruguay Round with their entire tariff schedule bound, either as a result of the tariff negotiations themselves (e.g. Argentina and Brazil), or the negotiation of their accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) during or immediately before the Round (e.g. Venezuela and Mexico respectively).
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